

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 5-10 are cancelled. Claims 1-4 and 11-12 remain pending in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claim 1 has been amended solely to have the claim better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yap (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0092021) in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,372) and further in view of Sasaki (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0150382). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of the references.

As an example, claim 1 recites:

the at least two signal processing mechanisms simultaneously performing compressive coding processing to the television signal delivered over the desired channel such that each one of the at least two signal processing mechanisms performs compressive coding processing at a respective compression rate that is different than that at which any other of the at least two signal processing mechanisms performs compressive coding processing.

(Emphasis added.) Neither the relied on sections of Yap, the relied on sections of Kim, nor the relied on sections of Sasaki disclose or suggest each one of at least two signal processing mechanisms performs compressive coding processing at a respective compression rate that is different than that at which any other of

the at least two signal processing mechanisms performs compressive coding processing.

The Office Action acknowledges that "Yap et al. and Kim et al. fail to explicitly teach" this feature but contends that Sasaki does and relies on ¶¶ [0094]-[0095] of Sasaki. However, such sections of Sasaki merely describe that N tuners and N encoders may be provided to simultaneously receive a plurality of video signals. There is no indication in this section of the reference that the each of the N encoders operates at a respective encoding rate that is different than that at which any other of the N encoders operates.

Such sections of Sasaki further describe that, alternatively, a single encoder may be operate a rate N times as high as the normal encoding rate to encode the N video signals received by the N tuners. This section of the publication is not concerned with at least two encoders and hence is not concerned with at least two encoders operating at a respective encoding rate that is different than that at which any other of the at least two encoders operates.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that neither the relied on sections of Yap, the relied on sections of Kim, nor the relied on sections of Sasaki, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the combination set out in claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of the references.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and therefore each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 11 and 12 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1 and

therefore each is patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied on sections of Yap, Kim and Sasaki for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: October 28, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Lawrence
E. Russ/
Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1510335_1.doc